

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of February 19, 2010 (Office Action) and the Advisory Action of May 11, 2010 (Advisory Action). The Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 14-1437.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §§ 102 & 103

Claims 1, 4-7, and 27-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 7,020,696 to Perry, et al. (hereinafter Perry). Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perry in view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary. Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perry with reference to the Background section of the present invention.

Although Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejections, Applicant has amended the independent Claims 1 and 27-28 to clearly recite that the system services are software programs that constantly run in the background of an operating system that perform actions for the operating system in order to facilitate prosecution of the instant application. The claim amendments are fully supported by the original disclosure and no new matter has been introduced.

Aspects of Applicants' Invention

It may be helpful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention prior to addressing the cited references. One embodiment of the invention is typified by system services within an administrative interface.

The method can include categorizing the system services into functional categories based on functions of the system services; and establishing a plurality of system service

profiles based on functional roles of users. The system services are software programs that constantly run in the background of an operating system that perform actions for the operating system. Each system service profile represents a customized subset of the system services.

The method also can include detecting a request for the presentation of system services from a user; ascertaining an identity of the user and at least one functional role associated with the user; determining at least one of the system service profiles corresponding to the at least one functional role of the user; determining at least one system service to be displayed in accordance with the at least one determined system service profile; and displaying the determined at least one system service within the administrative interface in a manner that the determined at least one system service is navigable based on the functional categories of the determined at least one system service, the at least one determined system service profile corresponding to the user, and computing devices providing the determined at least one system service.

See, e.g., Specification, paragraphs [0002] & [0028] to [0034]; see also Figs. 2-4.

The Claims Define Over The Prior Art

As described in col. 21, line 54 to col. 23, line 26 of Perry, the status window may include many tabs/folders for displaying various data about the network device configuration. The System tab 934 (FIG. 4s) provides system level data such as the system name 934a, System Description 934b, System Contact 934c, System Location 934d, System IP Address 934e (or DNS name), System Up Time 934f, System identification (ID) 934g, and System Services 934h. The Modules tab 936 (FIG. 4t) includes an inventory of the available modules in the network device and various details about those modules such as where they are located (e.g., shelf and slot, back or front). The inventory may also include a description of the type of module, version number, manufacturing date, part number, etc. In addition, the inventory may include run time

data such as the operational status and temperature. The Ports tab 938 (FIG. 4u) displays an inventory of the available ports in the network device and various details about each port such as where they are located (shelf, slot and port; back or front). The inventory may also include a description of the port name, type and speed as well as run time data such as administrative status, operational status and link status. The SONET Interface tab 940 (FIG. 4v) includes an inventory of SONET ports in the network device and various details about each port such as where they are located (shelf and slot; back or front). Medium type (e.g., SONET, Synchronous Digital Hierarchy (SDH)) may also be displayed as well as circuit ID, Line Type, Line Coding, Loopback, Laser Status, Path Count and other details. The System tab data as well as the Modules tab, Ports tab and SONET Interface tab data all represent physical aspects of the network device.

Clearly, the System tab, Modules tab, Ports tab, and SONET Interface tab of Perry do not represent system services, which are programs that constantly run in the background of an operating system that perform necessary actions for the operating system (see paragraph [0002] of the specification of the instant application), in the sense of the present invention. Rather, the System tab, Modules tab, Ports tab, and SONET Interface tab of Perry provide data that represent physical aspects of a network device.

It was asserted in the paragraph bridging pages 6 and 7 of the Office Action:

The Examiner is relying upon the System tab, Modules tab, Ports tab, and SONET Interface tab described in col. 21, line 54 to col. 23, line 26 of Perry to teach categorizing system services into functional categories based on functions of the system services. It is evident from the cited portions that services to the system are provided under each of these tabs. For instance, the Modules tab provides services such as available modules and run time data such as operational status of the available modules of the system. The functional category would be Modules and the services related to Modules are available under that tab. Therefore, Perry clearly teaches categorizing system services into functional categories based on functions of the system services.

As already discussed above, in Perry the System tab, Modules tab, Ports tab, and SONET Interface tab do not represent system services; rather these tabs only represent configuration (physical aspects) of a network device. In other words, the tabs in Perry provide data that represent various physical elements (such as information of available modules and ports) of the network device. These have nothing to do with system services in the sense of the present invention. It is noted that the available modules are not available services (software programs), but rather available hardware elements of the network device. In the present invention, system services (not hardware elements) are categorized into functional categories (such as Fax services, Print services, and Email services shown in Fig. 3) based on functions of the system services, not on physical aspects of a particular network device. Therefore, Perry clearly does not teach categorizing system services into functional categories based on functions of the system services, as recited in independent Claims 1 and 27-28 of the instant application.

It was asserted in the third paragraph on page 7 of the Office Action:

As discussed above, the System tab, Modules tab, Ports tab, and SONET Interface tab provide system services categorized into functional categories. The tabs of the interface provide access to the services provided by each function (Module, Port, etc.). Therefore, the tabs provide the navigation based on functional categories. If a user wanted to access services related to the Modules function, then they would click the Modules tab and have a listing of the services provided by the functional modules of the system. Therefore, the system services are navigable based on functional categories of the system services.

However, as already discussed above, the System tab, Modules tab, Ports tab, and SONET Interface tab of Perry do not represent system services and thus also do not provide system services categorized into functional categories and navigable based on functional categories of the system services. The Module, Port, etc. of Perry are types of hardware or physical elements of the network device, not functional categories of system

services. When a user clicks the Modules tab, the listing shows available modules in the network device, not system services related to the Modules function.

It was asserted in the first paragraph on page 8 of the Office Action:

In col. 52, line 22 – col. 58, line 5 of Perry, Perry describes the operation of the GUI demonstrated in figures 4A-4M. Perry disclose selecting one of the network devices listed in navigation tree 898 and then providing in the configuration window 897 the System, Modules, Ports, etc. tabs corresponding to the selected device to the user. Therefore, the system services for a device are navigable based on the computing device providing the system services because a network device is selected before the system services provided by that device is displayed.

However, as already discussed above, the System tab, Modules tab, Ports, etc. tabs of Perry do not represent system services provided by a network device; rather these tabs represent configuration (physical aspects) of the network device. It is also noted that in Perry the tabs correspond to one particular network device, not different computing devices providing the system services. Therefore, Perry does not disclose that the system services are navigable based on computing devices providing the system services. In fact, Perry does not disclose system services at all as discussed above.

It was asserted in the paragraph bridging pages 8 and 9 of the Office Action:

As discussed above, Perry teaches the system services navigable based on functional categories of the system services and the computing devices providing the system services. Perry further discloses in col. 47, lines 27-44 that customized GUI are provided to users based on their profile. The profiles limit access to only those network device resources in particular customer's network. Therefore, a user with a specific profile will be provided a GUI interface that only provides access to a limited set of network devices. From there a user can select a particular network device and be provided the system services related to that particular device as described above. Therefore, Perry clearly describes an interface in which the system devices are displayed in a manner that the system services are navigable based on functional categories of the system services, the profiles corresponding to roles of the users, and computing devices providing the system devices.

As already discussed above, Perry does not disclose system services and thus also does not disclose that the system services are navigable based on functional categories of the system services and the computing devices providing the system services. Perry further does not disclose that the system services are navigable based on profiles corresponding to roles of the users. Perry discloses in col. 47, lines 27-44 that customized GUIs are provided to users based on their profile. However, it is noted that the customized GUI only displays network devices for a particular user, not system services in the sense of the present invention.

It was asserted in the Advisory Action that the claims of the instant application do not recite that the system services are programs that constantly run in the background of an operating system that perform necessary actions for the operating system and that there is nothing in the claims that would restrict system services to represent software programs. Although Applicant believes that a claim term should be interpreted based on the definition provided in the specification, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1 and 27-28 to clearly recite that the system services are software programs that constantly run in the background of an operating system that perform actions for the operating system.

Accordingly, Perry fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of Claims 1 and 27-28. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 27-28 define over the prior art. Furthermore, as each of the remaining claims depends from Claim 1 while reciting additional features, Applicants further respectfully submit that the remaining claims likewise define over the prior art.

Applicants thus respectfully request that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicant requests that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 21, 2010

/Gregory A. Nelson/

Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Yonghong Chen, Registration No. 56,150
NOVAK DRUCE & QUIGG LLP
Customer No. 40987
525 Okeechobee Boulevard, 15th Floor
West Palm Beach, FL 33401
Telephone: (561) 847-7800